



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/597,107	04/20/2007	Charles Cottle	31578/44898	6166
4743	7590	09/14/2010	EXAMINER	
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP			POLLOCK, GREGORY A	
233 SOUTH WACKER DRIVE				
6300 WILLIS TOWER			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CHICAGO, IL 60606-6357			3695	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/14/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/597,107	COTTLE, CHARLES	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	GREG POLLOCK	3695	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07/06/2010.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 23,44,53,55,65,66,68,69,74,76-79,81,127 and 128 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 23,44,53,55,65,66,68,69,74,76-79,81,127 and 128 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to claims filed 10/597107 and Applicant's request for reconsideration of application 10/597107 filed 10/597107.

The amendment contains original claims 66, 69, 77-79, and 81

The amendment contains previously presented claims 53, 55, 68, 74, and 76.

The amendment contains amended claims 23, 44, 65, and 127.

Claims 1-22, 24-43, 45-48, 50-52, 54, 56-64, 67, 71-73, 75, 80, 82-126 have been canceled.

The amendment contains new claim 128.

As such, claims 23, 44, 53, 55, 65, 66, 68, 69, 74, 76-79, 81, 127 and 128 have been examined with this office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. **Claims 23, 44, 49, 53, 55, 65, 66, 68-70, 74, 76-79, and 81** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claims are directed toward the statutory category of a method (process), however based on Supreme Court precedent and recent Federal Circuit decisions, the Office's guidance to examiners is that a statutory § 101 process must (1) be tied to a particular machine or apparatus or (2) physically transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) to a different

state or thing. (i.e. "machine-or transformation test"). If neither of these requirements is met by the claim, method is not a patent eligible process under § 101 and is rejected as being directed toward non-statutory subject matter.

There are two corollaries to the machine-or-transformation test. First, a mere field -of-use limitation in the preamble is insufficient to render an otherwise ineligible method claim patent-eligible. The machine or transformation must impose meaningful limits on the method claims scope to pass the test. Second, insignificant extra-solution activity will not transform an unpatentable principle into a patentable process. Therefore, reciting a specific machine or a particular transformation of a specific article is an insignificant step, such as data gathering or outputting, is not sufficient to pass the test. Nominal recitations of structure in an otherwise ineligible method fail to make the method a statutory process. See Benson, 409 U.S. at 71-72. As Comiskey recognized, "the mere use of the machine to collect data necessary for application of the mental process may not make the claim patentable subject matter." Comiskey, 499 F.3d at 1380 (citing *In re Grams*, 888 F.2d 835, 839-40 (Fed. Cir. 1989)). Incidental physical limitations, such as data gathering, field of use limitations, and post-solution activity are not enough to convert an abstract idea into a statutory process. In other words, nominal or token recitations of structure in a method claim do not convert an otherwise ineligible claim into an eligible one.

As example of a method claim that would not qualify as a statutory process would be a claim that recited purely mental steps. Thus to qualify as a § 101 statutory process, the claim should positively recite the other statutory class (thing or product) to which it is tied, for example by identifying the apparatus that accomplishes the method steps, or positively recite the subject matter being transformed, for example by identifying the material being changed to a different state. (Diamond v. Diehr, 450 US 175, 184 (1981); Parker V. Flook, 437 US 584,588 n.9 (1978); gottschalk v. Benson, 409 US 63, 70 (1972); Cochrane v Deener, 94 US 780, 787-88 (1876)). Applicant is also directed to MPEP § 2173.05p, providing guidance with respect to reciting a product and process in the same claim and MPEP § 2111.02 [R3] providing guidance with respect to the effect of limitations within the preamble of a claim.

In reference to claims, the claims do not qualify as statutory process by identifying a “particular” machine that accomplishes the method steps. For example, claim 23 recites *inter alia* the claim limits “using the computer system to provide user a graphical user receiving at the computer system an order from the user for the versatile financial transaction electronically processing via the computer system the order for the subcomponent option transactions transmitting via the computer system the interrelated subcomponents to a trade executing entity for fulfillment only when each of the five subcomponent option transactions will execute as specified presenting the user, via the graphical

user interface, with a confirmation of an execution of trades for each of the order's subcomponents". However the limits of claim 1 do not recite what structural apparatus is performing the method steps of using, receiving, processing, transmitting and presenting. Where it is unclear what is performing a method step, such method step it is broadly interpreted to encompass all means by which the claim limit can be performed (including a purely mental step performed by a human). Note also that phrase such as "using the computer" or "via a computer" (where Webster's New World College Dictionary, 4th Ed. defines the term "via" as "by means of") do not resolve this deficiency since the action of the claim limit can still be broadly interpreted as being performed by a human using the structural machine and do not indicates that a particular machine has been programmed to perform the method step(s). A similar analysis is applicable to the remaining method claims and should also be addressed in future claim amendments. To resolve this deficiency, it must be made clear that the particular machine(s) impose(s) meaningful limitation(s) on the claim's scope (particularly claim limit(s) that are considered a core/central part of what the applicant invented) by, for example, being present in more than mere filed-of-use limitation(s), and that the use of the particular machine(s) involves more than insignificant extra-solution actively. Additionally, merely stating the underlying apparatus in the preamble is not sufficient. Further, if the method step is performed by software, it must be made clear that the software resides on a physical media and when read by a processor executes the method

steps (all of which requires support in the specification). It is recommended that the claim be amended to clarify which method steps are performed by automatically by code and which required human decisions or action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
5. Claims 23, 44, 53, 55, 65, 66, 68, 69, 74, 76-79, 81, 127 and 128 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nordlicht (PGPub Document No. 20050137964) in view of Himmelstein (U.S. Patent No. 6993511).

As per claim 23, Nordlicht teaches a method in a computer system of generating a versatile financial transaction the computer system including a processor and a memory coupled to the processor ([Title] [claim 29] [Figure 1]), comprising: using a computer system to providing a user a graphical user interface to select a versatile financial transaction from a plurality of possible versatile financial transactions ([¶11-13] [Figure 3] [¶62]); receiving at the computer system an order from the user for the versatile financial transaction, wherein the versatile financial transaction is related to an underlying instrument ([¶2-13] [¶11-13] [¶59] [¶63] [¶82]); wherein the versatile financial transaction is comprised of at least five subcomponent option transactions (multi-legged contracts or trade, see at least [¶2-13, especially ¶3, lines 30-31] [Table under ¶82, "Premium"] [¶89-109] [¶134-141]) wherein each of the at least five subcomponent option transactions is related to the underling instrument ([¶2-13] [¶11-13] [¶59] [¶63] [¶82]); electronically processing via a computer system the order for the subcomponent option transactions ([¶11-13] [¶116-117]); wherein the subcomponent option transactions are interrelated (multi-legged contracts or

Art Unit: 3695

trade, see at least [¶2-13, especially ¶3, lines 30-31] [Table under ¶82, “Premium”] [¶89-109] [¶134-141]); **wherein each of the at least five subcomponent option transactions is a specific type of option transaction** (see at least [¶2-13] [¶62-68] [¶72]); **transmitting via the computer system wherein the interrelated subcomponents to a trade executing entity for fulfillment** ([¶11-13] [¶58]); and **presenting the user, via the graphical user interface, with a confirmation of an execution of trades for each of en the order's subcomponents** ([¶64] [¶66]).

Nordlicht implies but does not explicitly indicate in its description, that the **subcomponent parameters specified in the order are based on ordering requirements made for the versatile financial transaction** (multi-legged contracts or trades trade as a unit or package, see at least [¶2-13, especially ¶3, lines 30-31] [Table under ¶82, “Premium”] [¶97-98] [¶106-107] and are sequenced [¶29] [¶86] [¶96]) and does not teach **wherein each of the at least five subcomponent option transactions specified in the order require the other subcomponent option transactions in the order to execute as specified, otherwise none of the at least five subcomponent option transactions will execute** ;

Himmelstein teaches a method **wherein subcomponent parameters specified in the order are based on ordering requirements made for the versatile financial transaction** ([column 9, lines 4-31, especially lines 12-13] [column 12, lines 1-15]) ([column 9, lines 4-31, especially lines 12-13] [column 12, lines 1-15]) **wherein each of the at least five subcomponent option transactions specified in the order require the other subcomponent option transactions in the order to execute as specified, otherwise none of the at least five subcomponent option transactions will execute** and that the transmission of the trade is executed **only when each of the five subcomponent option transactions will be executed as specified** (barter orders can have multiple interrelated orders required to fill an order [column 8, lines 10-60] and a “fill or kill” option or an “all or nothing” option can be used to when submitting barter orders [column 11, line 40 – column 12, line 15])

I would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the invention of Himmelstein with that of Nordlicht to achieve the claimed invention. One skilled in the art would be motivated to combine the inventions because Himmelstein incorporating the security stock into a Himmelstein Option that is bartered removes uncertainty (i.e. future risk). This is beneficial in many instances. For example, successful, educated investors desiring to decrease their stock portfolio can recognize this benefit and utilize the Himmelstein Option to reduce their stock portfolio in a controlled manner.

As per claim 44, Nordlicht teaches a method of **identifying an underlying financial instrument and identifying a versatile financial transaction for the underlying financial instrument** ([¶2-13] [¶11-13] [¶59] [¶63] [¶82]).

All of the remaining limits of Claim 44 have been previously addressed in Claim 23, and is therefore rejected using the same prior art and rationale.

As per claim 48, the rejection of claim 44 has been addressed.

All of the limits of Claim 48 have been previously addressed in Claim 44, and is therefore rejected using the same prior art and rationale.

As per claim 49, the rejection of claim 44 has been addressed.

Nordlicht implies but does not explicitly indicate in its description, that the **at least one of the subcomponents' specified in the order require other subcomponents in the order to execute as specified, otherwise both sets of subcomponents will not execute** (multi-legged contracts or trades trade as a unit or package, see at least [¶2-13, especially ¶3, lines 30-31] [Table under ¶82, "Premium"] [¶97-98] [¶106-107] and are sequenced [¶29] [¶86] [¶96]).

Himmelstein teaches a method **wherein at least one of the subcomponents' specified in the order require other subcomponents in the order to execute as specified, otherwise both sets of subcomponents will not execute** (barter orders use multi-order barter selection [column 8, lines 10-60] and can use the system as an intermediary and create barter orders for financials which it does not currently have possession [column 18, line 48 – column 23, line 5] and [Figures 3 and 7A-7E]. Once in possession, the order is matched [column 8, lines 10-60]).

I would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the invention of Himmelstein with that of Nordlicht to achieve the claimed invention. One skilled in the art would be motivated to combine the inventions because Himmelstein incorporating the security stock into a Himmelstein Option that is bartered removes uncertainty (i.e. future risk). This is beneficial in many instances. For example, successful, educated investors desiring to decrease their stock portfolio can recognize this benefit and utilize the Himmelstein Option to reduce their stock portfolio in a controlled manner.

As per claim 53, the rejection of claim 44 has been addressed.

All of the limits of Claim 53 have been previously addressed in Claim 23, and is therefore rejected using the same prior art and rationale.

As per claim 55, the rejection of claim 44 has been addressed.

All of the limits of Claim 55 have been previously addressed in Claim 44, and is therefore rejected using the same prior art and rationale.

As per claim 65, All of the limits of Claim 65 have been previously addressed in Claims 23 and 44, and is therefore rejected using the same prior art and rationale.

As per claim 66, the rejection of claim 65 has been addressed.
Nordlicht implies but does not explicitly indicate in its description, that the **wherein a complement order is made available to a trading market.**

Himmelstein teaches a method **wherein a complement order is made available to a trading market** (barter orders, which are financials [column 1, lines 14-36], [column 2, lines 29-50], [column 4, lines 28-45], [column 9, lines 32-49], especially [column 21, line 60 – column 22, line 24], are created and matched [column 2, lines 51-53] and [Figures 1, 3, 4A-4D, 7A-8] using Himmelstein Options in a virtual market [column 3, line 49 – column 4, line 45]).

I would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the invention of Himmelstein with that of Nordlicht to achieve the claimed invention. One skilled in the art would be motivated to combine the inventions because Himmelstein incorporating the security stock into a Himmelstein Option that is bartered removes uncertainty (i.e. future risk). This is beneficial in many instances. For example, successful, educated investors desiring to decrease their stock portfolio can recognize this benefit and utilize the Himmelstein Option to reduce their stock portfolio in a controlled manner.

As per claim 68, the rejection of claim 65 has been addressed.
Nordlicht teaches a method **wherein the subcomponent transactions are over-the-counter options transactions** (multi-legged contracts or trade, see at least ¶¶2-13, especially ¶3, lines 30-31] [Table under ¶82, “Premium”] ¶¶89-109] [¶134-141]).

As per claim 69, the rejection of claim 65 has been addressed.
All of the limits of Claim 69 have been previously addressed in Claims 23, and is therefore rejected using the same prior art and rationale.

As per claim 70, the rejection of claim 65 has been addressed.
All of the limits of Claim 70 have been previously addressed in Claims 49, and is therefore rejected using the same prior art and rationale.

As per claim 74, the rejection of claim 65 has been addressed.
All of the limits of Claim 74 have been previously addressed in Claims 23, and is therefore rejected using the same prior art and rationale.

As per claim 76, the rejection of claim 65 has been addressed.

Art Unit: 3695

All of the limits of Claim 76 have been previously addressed in Claims 23, and is therefore rejected using the same prior art and rationale.

As per claim 77, the rejection of claim 65 has been addressed.

Nordlicht teaches a method **wherein one order is populated for all subcomponents transactions** ([¶11-13] [Figure 4] [¶62] [¶76] [¶83]).

As per claim 78, the rejection of claim 65 has been addressed.

Nordlicht teaches a method **wherein one order is provided for each subcomponent transactions** (multi-legged contracts or trades trade as a unit or package, see at least [¶2-13, especially ¶3, lines 30-31] [Table under ¶82, “Premium”] [¶97-98] [¶106-107] and are sequenced [¶29] [¶86] [¶96]).

As per claim 79, the rejection of claim 65 has been addressed.

Nordlicht implies but does not explicitly indicate in its description, that the **wherein some subcomponents are amalgamated into one order and other orders are provided for each subcomponent** (multi-legged contracts or trades trade as a unit or package, see at least [¶2-13, especially ¶3, lines 30-31] [Table under ¶82, “Premium”] [¶97-98] [¶106-107] and are sequenced [¶29] [¶86] [¶96]).

Himmelstein teaches a method **wherein some subcomponents are amalgamated into one order and other orders are provided for each subcomponent** ([column 7, line 22 – column 13, line 61], [column 18, line 48 – column 23, line 5], [Figures 2, 3, 6, 7A-7E, 9A-9B]).

I would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the invention of Himmelstein with that of Nordlicht to achieve the claimed invention. One skilled in the art would be motivated to combine the inventions because Himmelstein incorporating the security stock into a Himmelstein Option that is bartered removes uncertainty (i.e. future risk). This is beneficial in many instances. For example, successful, educated investors desiring to decrease their stock portfolio can recognize this benefit and utilize the Himmelstein Option to reduce their stock portfolio in a controlled manner.

As per claim 81, the rejection of claim 65 has been addressed.

Nordlicht **wherein the versatile financial transaction is a SlingshotHedge** (see at least [¶2-13, especially ¶3, lines 30-31] [Table under ¶82, “Premium”] [¶89-109] [¶134-141] Note that a SlingshotHedge is a particular species of the generic contracts (trade orders) and does not change the underlying functionality of the method or apparatus.).

As per claim 127, Nordlicht teaches a **memory storage containing instructions configured to be executed by a processor, the instructions**

which, when executed by the processor, cause the performance of a method ([¶23-44]).

All of the remaining limits of Claim 127 have been previously addressed in Claim 23, and is therefore rejected using the same prior art and rationale.

As per claim 128, Nordlicht teaches a memory storage containing instructions configured to be executed by a processor, the instructions which, when executed by the processor, cause the performance of a method (“options contracts generally have a set quality, quantity, delivery time, strike price, expiration date and location depending upon the type of underlying associated with them. [¶2]).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with regards to claims 23, 44, 49, 53, 55, 65, 66, 68-70, 74, 76-79, 81, and 127, filed 10/26/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
7. APPLICANT REMARKS CONCERNING Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101: The applicant contends that the amended method claims overcome the prior 35 USC § 101.
8. EXAMINER'S RESPONSE: Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's arguments. The claims do not positively recite the other statutory class (thing or product) to which it is tied, by identifying the apparatus that accomplishes the method steps. The claims have been amended to include the phrases of “using the computer” or “via a computer” (where Webster's New World College Dictionary, 4th Ed. defines the term “via” as “by means of”). However, these phrases do not resolve this deficiency since the action of the claim limit can still

be broadly interpreted as being performed by a human using the structural machine and do not indicates that a particular machine has been programmed to perform the method step(s)..

9. **APPLICANT REMARKS CONCERNING Prior Art:** The applicant contends that none of the prior art of record teaches the newly amended claim limits “wherein each of the at least five subcomponent option transactions specified in the order require the other subcomponent option transactions in the order to execute as specified, otherwise none of the at least five subcomponent option transactions will execute” and that the transmission of the trade is executed “only when each of the five subcomponent option transactions will be executed as specified”.
10. **EXAMINER’S RESPONSE:** The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant’s arguments. Himmelstein (U.S. Patent No. 6993511) teaches the use of barter orders with interrelated dependencies and the use of and a “fill or kill” option or an “all or nothing” option which can be used to when submitting barter orders ([column 11, line 40 – column 12, line 15]). Therefore, during normal operation of the invention of Himmelstein, if the “fill or kill” option and/or the “all or nothing” option are used, the all of the interrelated orders required to fill a barter order must be present or the entire barter order is killed (or nothing is bartered).

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
 - Lange (PGPub No. 20040143396) - teaches [0068] Another preferred embodiment of the present invention provides a method for conducting demand-based trading including: (a) establishing a plurality of defined states and a plurality of predetermined termination criteria, wherein each of the defined states corresponds to one possible outcome of an event of economic significance (or a financial instrument); (b) accepting, prior to fulfillment of all of the termination criteria, a conditional investment order by a trader in at least one of the plurality of defined states; (c) computing, prior to fulfillment of all of the termination criteria a probability corresponding to each defined state; and (d) executing or withdrawing, prior to the fulfillment of all of the termination criteria, the conditional investment responsive to the computing step. In such embodiments, the computing step is responsive to the total number of value units invested in the plurality of defined states and the relative number of value units invested in each of the plurality of defined states. Such embodiments contemplate, among other implementations, a market or exchange (again without traditional sellers) in which investors can make and execute conditional or limit orders, where an order is executed or withdrawn in response to a calculation of a probability of the occurrence of one or more of the defined states. Preferred embodiments of the system of the present invention involve the use of electronic technologies, such as computers, computerized databases and telecommunications systems, to implement methods for conducting demand-based trading of the present invention.
12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory Pollock whose telephone number is 571 270-1465. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 AM - 4 PM, Mon-Fri Eastern Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chuck Kyle can be reached on 571 272-5233. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

GAP

09/12/2010

/Gregory Pollock/
Examiner, Art Unit 3695

Gregory A. Pollock

/Thu Thao Havan/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3695